10th Legislative Day 2/23/2007

HB0169	First Reading	64
HB0357	First Reading	2
SB0004	Recalled	4
SB0004	Third Reading	5
SB0009	Third Reading	28
SB0012	Third Reading	33
SB0013	Recalled	36
SB0013	Third Reading	36
SB0014	Third Reading	46
SB0029	Third Reading	47
SB0031	Third Reading	47
SB0046	Third Reading	48
SB0055	Third Reading	62
SB0057	Third Reading	50
SB0065	Third Reading	50
SB0119	Third Reading	51
SB0120	Third Reading	52
SB0152	Third Reading	54
SB0154	Third Reading	56
SB0186	Third Reading	60
SR0074	Resolution Offered	1
SJR0033	Adopted	65
SJR0033	Resolution Offered	65
Senate to Order-Senator Hendon		1
Prayer-Pastor John Hamilton		1
Pledge of Allegiance		1
Journal-Approved		1
Committee Reports		2
Senate calibrates Internet cameras		64
Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted		64
Adjournment		65
-		

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The regular Session of the 95th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor John Hamilton, Laurel United Methodist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Hamilton.

PASTOR JOHN HAMILTON:

(Prayer by Pastor John Hamilton)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Journal of Thursday, February 22nd, 2007.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Hunter moves to approve the Journals just read by the Secretary. There being no objection, so ordered. Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 74, offered by Senator Dillard and all

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Members.

It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 357, offered by Senator Noland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will all the Members under the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor? Would all administrative assistants please reach your Senator and direct them to come to the Senate Floor? We are about to take substantial Floor action. Would you please come to the Senate Floor? The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the President's Anteroom. Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Halvorson, Chairman of -- of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 4 and Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 13.

Signed -- Senator Debbie Halvorson, Chairman. Dated February 23rd, 2007.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MALONEY:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Purpose of announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your purpose.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you. And I'd just like the Senate to welcome our State Comptroller to the Floor, -- Comptroller Dan Hynes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The Senate please welcome Comptroller Hynes. Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State -- state your point.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Behind the Republicans, we have visiting us today the Logan County Leadership Academy from Lincoln, Illinois. Will you help me welcome them to Springfield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Our -- will our guests please stand and be acknowledged by the Senate? Senator Hendon in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just like the record to reflect that Senator Syverson is back in district today due to pressing matters. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The record will so reflect. The Senate will now be going to the top of page 2, top of page 2 on your Senate Calendar, Senate

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Bills 2nd Reading. ...Bill 38. Senator Brady. Senate Bill 75. Senator Collins. Senate Bill 82. Senate Bill 76. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 82. Senator Sandoval. Senate Bill 113. Senator Syverson. Will all Senators please come to the Senate Floor? We are about to go to 3rd Readings. Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUNTER:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR HUNTER:

This Sunday, one of our colleagues is having a wonderful birthday. She's made it through another year and I just want us to recognize her, State Senator Iris Martinez. Would you please recognize Iris Martinez's birthday?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Martinez, happy birthday, darlin'. Oh, look there. Doesn't look a day over twenty-one. Okay, Senators, we're about to go to the middle of page 2 on your Senate Calendar on the Order of 3rd Readings. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 4. Senator Schoenberg, on Senate Bill 4. Senator Schoenberg seeks leave of this Body to return Senate Bill 4 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 4. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Schoenberg. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Senator Schoenberg, to explain your amendment. SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 5 is a technical amendment that makes the penalty for human -- the ban on human reproductive cloning a Class 1 felony, pursuant to how it's been in earlier versions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Schoenberg moves the adoption of Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 4. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd is Senate Bill 4. Senator Schoenberg, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 4.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Today we have an opportunity - and some may even say an obligation - to favorably support Senate Bill 4, which expressly

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

prohibits human reproductive cloning, establishes a policy in the State of Illinois that embraces and encourages the expansion of all forms of stem cell research, including somatic cell nuclear transfer, which is a therapeutic stem cell research procedure. This legislation, which we've considered in earlier versions, is distinguished by a couple of key improvements. The first is that this legislation establishes a framework for the grant-making process that regulates that grant-making process which was initiated through the Governor's earlier Executive Orders. in addition, it has provisions for conflicts of interest and treatment of economic disclosure. The reason why we need to do this and do this today is because this research holds great promise for lifesaving breakthroughs in medical treatments and cures for diseases such as Type 1 diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's, cancer, spinal cord injury, and a number of other medical diseases and conditions. Therapeutic stem cell research creates stem cells which are genetically compatible to their recipient and allows for the successful implantation without rejection from the immune system. I'd like to clarify precisely where these cells come from, because there have been some statements made by opponents seeking to mischaracterize this fact. Only cells which are derived from excess embryos result -which are from in vitro fertilization treatments that have gone unused and would be discarded are utilized. In fact, in this bill, the informed consent of the donors is required to use these embryos for research - through a process quite similar to organ Moreover, there's a sharp and important distinction donation. between human reproductive cloning, which is banned in this bill and which carries a Class 1 felony for every occurrence, and

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

which is unethical, unsafe and unnecessary, and somatic cell nuclear transfer, which is also known in layperson's terms as therapeutic cloning, which has done the following: In groundbreaking research, rats have -- that were paralyzed from spinal cord injuries were able to regain their ability to walk after transplantation of specific nerve cells that are derived from mouse embryonic stem cells. Researchers at Stanford University who've been working on a cure for Type 1 diabetes are producing new pancreatic islet cells that could be used transplants and could bring about a cure for this devastating illness. And in an exciting discovery from the University of Texas at their Anderson Cancer Center, we've learned recently that stem cells can be engineered to act as a form of seek-anddestroy missile, capable of finding cancer cells in animals and destroying them. This innovative approach is being applied to models of leukemia, melanoma, breast cancer, ovarian cancer and brain tumors. We've heard testimony in committee this year and previous years from experts, such as Dr. Mary Hendrix, who have testified here that both embryonic and adult stem cell research are extremely important. However, there are certain inherent limitations within adult stem cells. this And understanding, based on what the scientific community tells us: First, that adult stem cells appear to be much more restricted in their ability to differentiate into the wide range of cell types present in the human body; secondly, that the ability of adult stem cells to replicate is not as robust as embryonic stem cells. They lack the same level of adaptability and plural plasticity as embryonic stem cells. Now there's been much discussion about the moral implications of this bill. In fact, many of the issues

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

that have been raised in this very context should be familiar to those of us who are more senior in this Body, because they are the identical questions that were asked when the General Assembly deliberated in a very thoughtful manner and ultimately affirmed the decision to require insurance coverage for in vitro fertilization. We have seen how that decision has impacted the lives of countless individuals and their families throughout this State. And that's another compelling reason why we should follow the science and encourage it, embrace it and help it grow. have seen how scientific breakthroughs have produced remarkable life changes. And we need to do everything possible that we can to ensure that that research is being supported and it's being done in a moral and ethical framework, and that there is a strict series of guidelines on the grant-making process and full disclosure and transparency on all the economic decisions that are made. So if you support in vitro fertilization, I think you can feel pretty comfortable supporting Senate Bill 4. been down this path before. We've seen how it has changed lives for the better. This is where the science is going. should help the scientists and their medical teams and the fine academic research institutions - some of which are right here in this State - do this important work in all forms of stem cell research. Senate Bill 4 gives Illinois the opportunity to ensure that it maintains its position as a national leader in scientific research and that we'll be able to continue to attract worldclass researchers and physicians. There -- it clarifies that there's an express ban on human reproductive cloning. There are procedures and protocols for couples to provide informed consent to donate their unused in vitro treatments for medical science.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

And we provide a framework that has transparency and accountability for a formalized grant-making process. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

There any discussion? Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Thank you, Mr. President. A quick question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Go right ahead.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Senator, wonder just specifically in the legislation - you had talked about that this is just using existing in vitro embryos - is there specific language in the bill that limits it, so there's not creation of embryos to be used to take stem cells? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

There's an express ban against human reproductive cloning. There's also a prohibition against reimbursement or compensation for people to do just that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Senator, there's no specific ban on creating embryos for the use of taking stem cells from them? Is that -- correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The -- there is a ban on human reproductive cloning. And in

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

practical terms, there are millions upon millions of unused embryos from in vitro fertilization treatments that are going to be discarded, and have been discarded historically otherwise, and those are the -- those are the embryos and unused in vitro treatments that are going to be used. There is a ban because of the concern by the scientific community, as well as by many others, that the path that you're intimating might be treaded down, would be. That's -- that's exactly why we have such a tough penalty of a Class 1 felony against human reproductive cloning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Real quickly: I am for stem cell research. I'm excited about the potential that's out there. I appreciate the Senator's hard work on this. I do disagree with this bill and I'm going to be voting No on this bill. I'm excited that next week we're going to have an opportunity to vote on Senator Haine's bill that also deals with -- with stem cell research here in the State of Illinois, Senate Bill 19, really relying again on the greatest promise for the future for people who suffer from horrible disease and injury here in the State of Illinois. So I support stem cell research. I just think this is the wrong direction to go. I encourage my colleagues as well in the Senate to join me next week in supporting Senator Haine's Senate Bill 19. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to speak on this bill. My father died from lung cancer when I was fifteen. My husband's grandmother suffered from Parkinson's. My best friend's father spent many years in a nursing home with Alzheimer's before he passed away. My sister's best friend is a three-year breast cancer survivor. That would sound like good news, except that her husband was just diagnosed with a very aggressive form of They are both in their thirties, raising their sixyear-old daughter. These are just a few of the stories that have touched my life, and I'm sure that many of you and your family and your friends have been touched by life-altering diseases. I think of myself as one of the luckiest people in the world, because I've been diagnosed with MS for eighteen years. been able to lead a very active and full life. And I'm also able to put a face to this disease. Yes, I do make sure to schedule my annual ski trip every year, because I never know which year will be the last year I may be able to ski. So I think of this disease also as -- as making me live my life fully and it has also been a factor in my decision to run for office, because I think I put a face to MS. The medical profession has always -their goal is to prevent and to cure or reduce the severity of disease. Research has provided many medical breakthroughs that we appreciate today. I mean, let's look at all the vaccinations out there that have virtually eliminated some diseases. Do we know for sure if stem cell research will lead to a cure or the elimination of any catastrophic illnesses? No, we don't know that. But, do we owe it to ourselves to find out if it can? Absolutely. So Senate Bill -- I think is an extremely important step in the fight against life-threatening diseases. And, Mr.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

President, I urge a Yes vote on Senate Bill 4. And I also want to thank Senator Schoenberg for bringing this to the Floor. Thank you so much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you. Senator Schoenberg, first, this bill itself does not -- contain any appropriations language in it, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

That's correct. What it does do is formalize the establishment of the Institute for Regenerative Medicine and it provides strict disclosure and conflict of interest provisions for any disbursement of public funds. As you're aware, we've already had -- fifteen million dollars' worth of grants that have been awarded, and this would regulate any further grant-making.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Can -- what can you tell us, Senator Schoenberg, about your knowledge of what appropriations bills, or appropriations generally, may be made that will -- will run through Senate Bill 4, the framework that you've set up?

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I -- I can tell you, Senator, that there are independent appropriations bills which have been filed both in the House and the Senate. I'm the sponsor of one in the Senate. It's identical to the one that my friend and supporter and chief sponsor of this measure, House Minority Leader Cross, has introduced, namely, a twenty-five-million-dollar appropriation for that money to be coming from the State's Tobacco Settlement proceeds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Schoenberg, on a different subject, in reading the language now in Senate Bill 4, as opposed to the language that was contained both in House Bill 3589 from a few years ago and House Bill - and I apologize - House Bill or Senate Bill 2100 of two years ago, the way the -- the human cloning ban, or the way that you've defined that, that language is different now than it was in those two previous bills. Why did you make that change?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Amendment No. 5 changed the bill specifically in the area of the penalty so as to make it uniform.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Schoenberg, I'm not referring to the criminal penalty. I'm referring to the definition of the human cloning ban itself - what it -- the definition of what it is you're prohibiting, not the penalty for violating that. That is different in Senate Bill 4 than it was either in House Bill 3589 or Senate Bill 2100. I'm asking why that change was made.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

While the exact language may be somewhat different, the very -- the very idea is actually the same, namely, that there's an express ban on human reproductive cloning. There is a sharp distinction, as I indicated in my opening remarks, between human reproductive cloning and somatic cell nuclear transfer, which is referred to in lay terms as therapeutic cloning. This is the language that was agreed to both by myself and which is featured in the House version as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter, are you -- are you done? Senator Righter.
SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, Mr. President, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

To the bill, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Always.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

First, I rise first to thank Senator Schoenberg for what have been his dedicated efforts, not just on this bill, but the two bills that I mentioned previously that this Chamber has addressed. I have immense respect for the Senator, the people who have worked with him on this bill and all of those who advocate on this particular issue. I hope that those people, including Senator Schoenberg, have respect for those who rise in opposition to this legislation as well. I appreciate the political value of engaging in demonization and scare tactics. That's not what we should be about here on the Senate Floor. I think it's important, first, in talking about this bill to -- to realize - and the previous speaker or -- brought that to light: talking about stem cell research in the general fashion is one thing, but there are different types of stem cell research. we all know that - all of us, I hope, who are sitting on this Floor know that and I would assume the House Members do as well. But often times when we talk to the press about it, those distinctions are lost on them. I don't know anyone in this Chamber, I don't know anyone in the House Chamber who does not fully and wholeheartedly with one hundred percent of their being support stem cell research, whether it's using adult stem cells or stem cells derived from cord blood or, now, we're talking about from amniotic fluid. There is a particular type of stem cell research called embryonic stem cell research that many have a problem with and I'm one of those individuals. It's ironic, I think, that Senator Schoenberg, in his opening comments, analogized and almost placed a moral equivalency between in vitro fertilization, which is a life-giving, life-creating process, and embryonic stem cell research, which by any valid scientific

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

definition is the creation of life, even if it's in its earliest hours or earliest days, in order to destroy that for purposes of research. I do not question, no one on this side of the aisle, I don't think anyone in this Capitol questions the value of the goal. We have heard year in and year out, in the committee rooms in this building, Mr. President, moving, incredibly moving testimony from individuals who want help. We all appreciate that. We all understand that. And we all want to help them. But there are those who do not believe that that goal, the promise - and that's all it is right now in embryonic stem cell research - the promise of embryonic stem cell research is worth destroying that life even in its earliest stages. But let's talk about another issue. Aside from embryonic stem cell research itself, this bill calls for the public funding of it. every other area of policy, our constituents, regardless of the district in which you serve, expect you to use their hard in -hard-earned dollars and spend it on matters, or issues, or programs, or initiatives that will get the best bang for their dollar. And it is without dispute that the overwhelming majority, if not exclusively, the practical gains that have been made in the area of stem cell research have been made in areas where the stem cells are derived from adult stem cells or blood, cord blood. Those are the areas that have really reached out and touched the people that we represent and those are the only Isn't it a problem for us to tell our constituents that we're going to take their public tax dollars and put them toward a -- something that is a promise, but only a promise? stand in opposition to this bill, if you say I don't want my taxpayer dollars going to fund embryonic stem cell research,

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

you're not saying that you're not for stem cell research. You're not saying that you're not for embryonic stem cell research. You're saying that right now, at this point in time, there have not been enough advances made to justify my taxpayer dollars going behind it. And I think that that is a critical problem with this legislation. Mr. President, thank you very much for the time. I oppose Senate Bill 4 and hope others will as well. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank -- thank you, Senator. I understand this is a -- a passionate issue. Would Senators remember we are -- no one is on the timer, but keeping that under consideration. WICS-TV ABC News Channel 20 requests leave to videotape proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Raoul. SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I -- I'd like to commend the sponsor for his work over the years on -- on this issue. I'm not going to address the moral arguments -- the moral arguments that surround this debate, because I don't believe that anything that -- can be said on this Floor to convince somebody to abandon their moral position on this issue. Instead, I'm going to deal with what was mentioned by the last speaker with regards to the practical gains of adult stem cell research versus embryonic stem cell research. I think in any type of investment that you make in research to the extent that you make research over many -- to -- to the extent that you make an investment over many years into one pool and you don't make the same investment into another pool, you're obviously going to reach a point where you have greater advancement in one area of research. And that's been the case for adult stem cell research

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

versus embryonic stem cell research. So we -- we have about thirty years of investment into adult stem cell research, and obviously you're going to have what is being referred to as better results. That said, I think I used this analogy in the We have all types of research that go into pharmaceutical treatment of ailments. That one drug may treat an ailment one way does not mean that we abandon investment into another possible means of treatment of ailment. You know, oftentimes politics of self-preservation dictate what we do in this Chamber, and it's -- it's -- it's unfortunate. But to ease those who may have the pressure of politics of -- selfpreservation on their shoulders, there has been significant movement in the popular embracing of embryonic stem cell And that's because diseases don't discriminate. Diseases don't attack one side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle. They don't attack one area of the State or another area of the State. Diseases don't attack just Catholics, or just Jews, or Muslims. Diseases just don't attack Blacks, or browns or whites. The types of diseases that we're talking about here, I think every Member in this Chamber can think of somebody, either in their family or in their neighborhood, that has been impacted. And so with that, let's -- on this one issue, let's not let the politics of self-preservation dictate what button we push. I rise in strong support and I ask for an Aye vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen,

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

first, we should do no harm. In this proposal, we'll -- we will legalize spending an open-ended commitment of taxpayer funds to conduct controversial and speculative embryonic stem cell The Civic Committee of the Commercial Club has research. recently made the case that Illinois is insolvent, considering only its current obligations. Now our attention and taxpayer funds are being diverted from education, property taxes, safe transportation, and reduction of pervasive corruption by very seductive promises of cures for diseases like diabetes. Alzheimer's, and even cancer. I support privately funded stem cell research that does not destroy innocent human life. I am sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 4, to that end. Obviously, we all want cures for diseases; the question is, "What are we willing to sacrifice to get them?" A human embryo, a fertilized egg, unites the essential genetic material that defines all of us as individual human beings. In the process of embryonic stem cell research as it's currently practiced, scientists discard the original life within fertilized egg and replace it with foreign, genetic material that they prefer to grow in that space instead. The unique identity of an individual human being vanishes for eternity. Naturally, we all want cures for diseases. grandfather suffered diabetes. My brother suffers from it now. My -- my sister suffered -- survived juvenile rheumatoid arthritis. And it was tragic to watch my father slowly debilitated by neurodegenerative disease. Every person whom we serve has a stake in the success of scientists, although eventually each of us will lose our struggle with immortality. There are at least three major areas of reason why all conscientious legislators ought to hesitate before we leap on the

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

bandwagon of approving what could become a hundred and twentyfive million dollars of taxpayer money to fund embryonic stem cell research: moral compromise, scientific productivity and nondestructive alternatives, and fiscal responsibility. yourself the question, "When is the cure for my disease more important than your life or your individual human identity?" Responsible human beings have recognized from the beginning of medicine that there need to be limits to what some are willing to do to others in the name of research. Hippocrates, the Greek philosopher and father of medicine, taught the first medical ethic, "First, do no harm", in his Hippocratic Oath. The unique identity of an individual human being is the first casualty to this research, as it's currently done. The destruction of an embryo is not necessary to derive the greatest portion of the research benefits in two ways. First, patients with fifty-eight different medical conditions have been helped by adult and umbilical cord stem cell research, where an embryo is not destroyed. However, no clinical cures have been produced so far as a result of human embryonic stem cell research. Secondly, researchers like Professor Kevin Eggan at Harvard University Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology and Dr. George Daley of Children's Hospital and Harvard Medical School are working on techniques like fusion regeneration and parthenogenesis which represents a third, nondestructive alternative where an embryo is not sacrificed. When they succeed, this entire -- divisive debate will disappear. The -- a truly extreme position in this controversy would be to stubbornly insist upon controversial and speculative research that requires the destruction of a human embryo. Finally, beware of what proponents are actually

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

promising. They speculate that spending potentially a hundred and twenty-five million dollars of taxpayer money will produce However, they know that these results are cures. quaranteed. Some politicians promise to balance a budget, but They promise to properly fund education, but don't deliver. don't deliver. They promise to provide utility rate relief, but don't deliver. And they promise to pay their current Medicaid obligations to local health care providers on time, but don't deliver. These promises are relatively straightforward and have been broken. But now, in this latest proposal, they want us to believe that our tax money will produce cures for every disease. How many times do we need to be disappointed before we discern the consistent pattern of the unreliability but constant overreach of distant government? Most people I serve distinguish between good research that heals physically and spiritually, and They recognize that the most bad research that destroys. immediate therapies are from adult and umbilical cord stem cell research, and in the long-run from nondestructive embryonic stem cell research. We need to approach these decisions with humility and patient hard work. We should study and incorporate the thoughts of our best ethicists, scientists, and fiscal experts, and moral leaders. Now is the time for these men and women to have their voices heard. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Kotowski.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of Senate Bill 4 and I want to thank Senator Schoenberg for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Comptroller Hynes for all of

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

his advocacy on this issue as well. I support this bill for a number of reasons. As someone who grew up in a household with a brother who has juvenile diabetes since the age of seven, who's been taking shots and now has an insulin pump, and has endured a lot of the challenges of diabetes - stem cell research offers a tremendous amount of promise and hope in curing the illness that he suffers from. From a personal standpoint, I've had epilepsy from the time I was thirteen and I've lived with epilepsy. fortunately, I take medication which helps me to live in a pretty regular way. Stem cell research offers great promise for people like me throughout the State of Illinois. It offers a wonderful opportunity to make sure people can live even better lives, because there's people with epilepsy who cannot go to work, who cannot function, who don't have the opportunity that I have to serve as a State Senator. I also support this bill because it can alleviate suffering in a number of areas, in a number of diseases. It can create economic opportunity. Because shouldn't we be at the forefront of biotechnology and bioresearch when everyone's talking about ways in which we can create jobs? life-giving legislation offers up a great opportunity to save lives, to cure illnesses and create jobs. And I support this legislation and I request an Aye vote for it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, as -- as many have -- have very eloquently stated here both sides of the -- of the sort of ideological approach to this - and I -- I don't want to get back into that, because I think it's been covered very well - I, as

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Senator Righter indicated, do support stem cell research. However, my trouble with where we're at right now, and with this bill in particular, is that we're in a time where we have record backlog of bills that are owed to medical providers and others throughout this State. And to me, it is simply irresponsible for us to take on - as dramatic an undertaking as this research really is - to take on this responsibility, particularly when there is a substantial private sector ready, willing and able to take this on should it actually bear -- have the potential that's proposed to bear fruit. To me, I feel we've got to get our financial house in order - it's currently not in order - before we go on with a major expansion, such as this proposes, from an economic standpoint. And it's for that reason that I oppose this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you, Senator. And, Senator Murphy, I want to let you know that the Chair appreciates you being succinct and I'll always give you the opportunity to speak on the Floor more than the long-winded Senators. Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Last time on this issue, I gave a long and emotional speech, and I'm not going to do that today. But I do want to, once again, reiterate that I've always been a champion for Illinois' medical and scientific, technological and research communities, including Argonne National Laboratory, which is up by my neck of the woods. And I just returned, albeit from a basketball game, from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and one of the things that has always made Illinois a great State, different from many others, is that we

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

are a leader in biotechnology, agricultural research, physics, and medical research. My father just had a kidney transplant a week ago at Rush University, and I stay very active with the University of Chicago, one of the five greatest universities in -- in the world. And Senator Schoenberg, I know, stays very active with Northwestern University. I'm proud to hold what I call a pro-life philosophy as a legislator, but I believe that actual human life begins in a womb; it does not begin in a Petri dish over four or five days. And I recognize that many of my pro-life friends do not agree with me, but many devout pro-lifers nationwide and members of my political party do agree me -- do agree with me, like Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah and a woman named Nancy Reagan, who used to be the First Lady of the United States. The reality -- and I still vividly remember after that emotional date and debate last time, going and sitting next to Senator Meeks, who sits down by where -- Senator Koehler was in those days. And Jim and I -- Reverend Meeks and I discussed the issue. And the Floor was empty. It was just Reverend Meeks and myself talking about what a difficult issue this is, and we went through a number of things. And -- and I know Senator Meeks, I believe, supports this initiative, and he made me think about something that I actually had not thought about. But these embryos, sadly, are discarded down a drain. They go into the public sewer system of the State of Illinois. And I really believe that my maker would want me to use these embryos to sustain and improve human life for those who have disease, rather than dumping these embryos down a sewer, a drain or a toilet. My wife has Crohn's disease and that certainly -- and she and I have talked to research physicians at Northwestern University and I have spent

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

time with people from the Crohn's & Colitis Foundation - not necessarily the juvenile diabetes and other groups that turn public opinion - but that's one particular aspect of my life that certainly influences my vote. Finally, I've spent a lot of time researching and thinking about this issue from both a scientific and religious point of view. One of the things I do know -- and I applaud my colleagues, and there is tremendous hope with adult stem cell research. My two young children, ages six and four, we have their umbilical cord blood frozen with a company called Cryo-Shell out of -- or, Cryo-Cell out of California. But there are properties of embryonic stem cells that are different and that offer different hope that adult stem cells cannot do. I'm not a scientist, but I've talked to many of 'em and embryos do hold a different type of research possibility than the adult stem cells. So with that, a lot shorter, a lot less emotional, nonetheless a very difficult vote for me, but I stand in support of Senate Bill 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Much of what I was -- I'm going to say was really said by Senator Dillard. I wanted to agree with many of the things he said and just reiterate a few other things. First of all, so many people have -- risen to speak and say they support stem cell research, but not embryonic stem cell research. And I think this is not something that is really realistic. If you really support stem cell research, where the most promise is, where the most value is - and this is scientists across the board, ethicists across the board will agree - it's

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

with embryonic stem cell research. So you can't really have it both ways. You can't be saying back to your constituents who all support this, "Well, yes I support stem cell research, but not just embryonic stem cell research." This is where the promise This is where science needs to go, and this is what we have to encourage. And secondly, and I -- this -- Senator Dillard made this point first, nobody else has since -- before him, that these are embryos that are going to be destroyed. We are not creating embryos, as Senator Schoenberg said, for the purpose of -- of doing this. These are embryos that would be destroyed if -- except for the fact that now we're going to be using them in a -- in a positive way for science to help people. If you believe that that's not -- that that's not right, then your next logical step is to say, "Well, maybe we should be prosecuting those people who are destroying these embryos." I don't think anybody on this Floor has ever suggested that, but that would be the logical next step. So I just want to -- us all to very -- think very clearly about those who talk about science, and maybe those who are talking about science today are also having problems believing in the theory of evolution. Maybe they think that's not sound science. What Senator Schoenberg is talking about today is sound science, as is the theory of -- of evolution. We need to -- we need to all really work together on this and understand that this is another area where the public is so far ahead of political leaders and legislators in this -- in this matter. They understand its value. They want us to support this. And what we're doing today I think is a step in a very, very important direction that's going to mean hope and longer life and better health for many, many people in Illinois.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

thank Senator Schoenberg for bringing this measure forward. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg, to close.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I -- I appreciate many of the remarks that have been made today and I certainly want to single out in my thanks Hynes, Minority Leader Cross, Representative Comptroller Feigenholtz, who have stood at the beginning of this fight here at the State Capitol. And it's been a just fight, because this is one of the most morally compelling challenges facing those of us in the public arena today. And two years ago, we stood at the doorway of accepting this challenge, but we could not cross the threshold. And today I believe that we are poised to do just that. And as a result of the decisions that we're going to make today, I say confidently that we will be giving scientists the ability to further pursue their work in a moral and ethical framework in pursuit of cures for many diseases and conditions. An inherent part of science is comparative analysis. key difference between art and science. Science is data-driven. Science, you have to have pure comparative analysis. The science is leading us in this direction and we should take it by the hand and move forward together. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 4 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay, none

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

voting Present. Senate Bill 4, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 9. Senator Garrett. ...Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 9.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. This bill creates the Illinois Climate Change Act. It authorizes the appointment of a Deputy Director for Climate Change within the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. The bill will direct IEPA to conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Illinois and report its findings to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1, 2008. By July 1, 2008, the IEPA is to present to the Governor and General Assembly a plan to significantly reduce the reported greenhouse gas emissions level by 2020.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

There any discussion? Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will yield. Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Yes. In the committee when we discussed this bill, we talked about the cost that is involved with this. Will the report that's submitted back include those in the report?

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, Senator, as I stated in the committee, the purpose of this Deputy Director is to report his or her findings. And in those findings, we would hope that the cost would be included. That report will come back to us in the Senate. We will also have to confirm that person as well. So there will be oversight and accountability. And I will ask that the cost -- associated with this will be included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think it's very important that we do include the cost in this, because while I'll agree that we do have a -- a warming of the Earth, we certainly stand in the middle of some of the most fertile farmland in the world and that was created by glaciers that was here. And certainly, those glaciers are not here today, so the Earth is warming. There's the big -- big debate and the big issue is, is whether -- what is causing that warming, if it's just natural cycles or if -- if man is truly causing the major warming of -- of the Earth. And so I don't think we can -- should enter into this with the assumption that man is causing that, because I think that debate is going on right now. But certainly, the cost to our economy and our society ought to be included in this report. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Luechtefeld.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will yield. Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I was not familiar with this bill until today. Senator, is -- this is one year they -- this Deputy Director will be assigned to do this? Is this a new person that you're going to put on staff?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. What we hope to do is designate a separate job for this Deputy Director who will be the point person, who will be the person in charge to collect all of this information, report back to the General Assembly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Is it your intention then, is once that report is made that his job is gone and he finds another job? Or will -- what's - or will he stay on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Senator, I -- it's not for me to say. And I -- it -- it's too early to determine what the lifespan of his employment or her employment would be. The purpose of this is to really put this program together. It may be that additional information and

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

additional duties are needed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Well, if they're supposed to -- if he's supposed to report back, or she, after a -- in a year and -- then what will you do at that point? Will it take another law to -- to continue that person's service?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Well, actually I was hoping that the debate wouldn't be over the tenure of this person, but now that you've asked, if we are to take this issue seriously - and I think we as a Body should - the point of having somebody like this is, as I've already said, to collect this information, this data. At that point in time, it's up to us to decide what the next steps are. He or she will be appointed. We will have to go through that process right here in the Senate. So let's just take it one step at a time and not assume that this person will be there indefinitely. I think the next step is to find out what the report tells us and then we'll know what the next step should be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I support this bill and I ask for your support on it. As it now makes its way over to the House, there are two words in there, that this plan is to "significantly reduce" the greenhouse gas emissions. I would

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

hope that maybe over on the House side, they could put some more detail and definition to that "significantly reduced" and to also add in there that the plan should also include the cost of each of the different operations. So, in other words, if we want to reduce it by five percent, it's going to cost you this much and you got to do A, B, C, D and E. So I would hope that some of those details might be added as it goes over to the House and then eventually comes back to us. I urge your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 9 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 44 voting Aye, 13 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 9, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Wilhelmi, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President. On a point of personal privilege. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, it is my distinct pleasure to rise this morning and recognize one of our colleague's birthdays. In fact, it's not only one of my colleagues; it's one of my seatmates. And the rumor is that Senator Deanna Demuzio is thirty-seven years old today. So, in honor of her wonderful birthday, let's rise and applaud. And also, you'll have cookies dropped off to your offices in honor of

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Senator Demuzio's birthday. Happy birthday, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Happy birthday, Senator Demuzio. Will you stand please? A cake would have been better, Senator, but I guess the cookies will have to suffice. Senator Meeks, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I pause for the purpose of recognizing -- of recognizing on the Senate Floor the Treasurer of the State of Illinois, Treasurer Alexi Giannoulias. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Treasurer Giannoulias, welcome to the Senate Floor, sir. Continuing with our business. Senate Bill 12. Senator Collins. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 12.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 12 increases -- increases the credit allowed with respect to the federal earned income tax credit from five percent to 7.5 percent in the tax calendar year ending 2007, and it increases the EITC to ten percent in the tax calendar year ending 2008 and beyond. The current Illinois earned income tax credit was made permanent in 2003, allowing qualifying taxpayers to take a State tax credit equal to five percent of the federal

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

credit. At five percent, that puts our top available credit for working families at only two hundred and twenty dollars. At five percent, Illinois' credit is the smallest of the nation's twentyone other states that have EITCs. Other states range from --EITCs range as high as thirty percent of the federal credit in New York, forty-three percent in Wisconsin and forty-six percent for Minnesota. So given that scenario, we feel that in order to help working families and benefit working families and the children, that raising the cost does three primary things. see it as a work incentive, because it available -- it's only available to working families' households and it helps to lift our lowest-paid workers out of poverty. Two, it eases taxes, helping to offset low-income families' unfairly large share of State and local taxes. In tax year 2003, the poorest one-fifth of Illinois households paid about thirteen percent of their incomes in State and local taxes, while the wealthiest one percent spent less than six percent of theirs in such taxes. I believe it also provides a economic stimulus, because it allows the working families to save more money and invest in the neighborhood stores, banks and other businesses. Let me also say that the federal EITC was created by the Nixon and Ford administrations in 1975 and expanded upon by President Reagan and Clinton. In fact, President Reagan called it the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job-creation measure to come out of Congress. So I -- I would ask for your support. And I'm open for any questions from my colleagues.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I -- I love it when Senator Collins rises and quotes from President Reagan. I think that it's wonderful among other good leaders of this country. The Revenue Committee supported Senator Collins' legislation I'd like to join her in cosponsoring the unanimously. legislation, as many of your colleagues have already. And there was one -- there was one question that was raised during committee work yesterday that I'd just like to confirm and It was a concern that was raised: emphasize. Might this be perceived as an additional incentive to residents of Illinois who are not legally residents? Could this be an -- another incentive for illegal residents? And because it follows the federal law, a -- a person is not qualified for their earned income tax credit if a social security number is issued solely for the use of applying for or receiving federally funded benefits, or instead of a social security number, a person has an individual taxpayer identification number. So the -- if there is a concern on the part of anybody who wants to support this bill that somehow it would be an incentive for illegal activity, that is not a worry that people need to be. So I rise in support and I appreciate your work on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 12 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 12, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- Senator Murphy. Senate Bill 13. Senator

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Link seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 13 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 13. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. -- I'm sorry. Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LINK:

This is just a technical amendment. I would ask for its approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Link moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 13. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it. And the amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments approved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 13. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill No. 13.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 13 is the extension -- is the extension of the seven-percent Homestead Exemption Act for three more years. This also creates the Returning Veterans' Homestead Exemption Act, which will go into effect even if counties do not enact seven percent, which will allow returning veterans to have a five-thousand-dollar property tax exemption upon their return from active duty in an armed conflict area. This exemption is an opportunity to give returning veterans their lives back in order upon their return. Also in this bill is to give counties that do adopt this a -- do adopt a resolution to provide senior citizens granted their exemptions, that they need not reapply every year for their Homestead Exemption Act. know, we do not get any younger every year. The exemption allowed on this is the seven -- the other principal part of this bill is the extension of the seven-percent Homestead Exemption Act, and there are various changes in which I will be more than happy to answer upon questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Senator, as we go through the process now - and I have every belief that this will pass the Senate here - I had brought a situation to your attention. And I just want to put it on the

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

record and bring it again, that in the implementation of this over the past three years, there have been some instances, particularly where a property was changing owners, where the exemption was dropped for that period -- that year, causing that homeowner -- because in Cook County the first bill that they get is an estimated bill based on the previous year's taxes, the second -- and then the second installment is actually the bill. Because this exemption went away, their taxes went sky-high. And they were -- they were aghast at to why that could happen. This was a situation that I brought to your attention in committee. My husband wrote a letter to you. The assessor's office also, in testimony yesterday, said that they would be looking into it. And I would encourage you, as this goes over to the House now, to continue working on it, so that we can tie up that little loose end before it comes back here to the Senate. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

As I indicated to you, Senator Pankau, that we have given that to the assessor's office. And I want to indicate, the reason we give it to the assessor's office, Cook County is the only county that has adopted this piece of legislation so far. In this law -- in this piece of legislation, the other hundred and one counties are allowed to adopt this if they -- their county boards should desire. But right now, Cook County is the only one that has adopted it in the last three years. We turned this over to the assessor's office. If they see where we have to make a change, I have told you - and I will give it for legislative intent - I will be more than happy to amend this bill

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

either in the House or when it comes over, if it comes over in a change, to amend it at that time, or do a trailer bill to amend it at that time, if -- if we can do it or how we have to do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I actually have just a few comments. I rise in opposition to this bill. Obviously the first elements of the bill that were discussed are very favorable. But with respect to the seven-percent solution - and I happen to live in the county that it does affect - it's important that we keep in mind this bill is not a cap on taxes in any way, shape or form, not for any group. The fact is, it's a tax shift, because it doesn't reduce, at all, what the taxing bodies are spending. Somebody has to pay that bill. And to the extent one group gets a break from paying that bill, it simply shifts the burden onto other groups. So it is not what it -- it appears to be by any means. Another issue I have is that there is evidence that it does, in fact, affect the General State Aid formula. That is an important piece of information, because as you know, to the extent it -- it affects the State Aid Formula, it will impact what the State has to put towards those schools. Now we did request a fiscal note on that. The Department of Revenue responded that there was no fiscal impact. Statute, it says if it does affect the State Aid Formula, the State Board should respond. They have not responded to us. And there is, in fact, an impact on that. I also want to point out to people that might be considering voting for this, a lot of groups, well-respected, that support all of us are opposed to

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

this, including the Realtors, the Education Association, the Federation of Teachers, the Municipal League, the Restaurant Association, the Metro Counties and the South Cook Cooperative on Public Education, which is, again, the south suburban school districts. And this is a bill that applies to them. So I think they've got a good reason for their opposition and I would encourage you to think very carefully before you support this bill. I think it is -- it is bad and it is misleading. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you -- thank you very much, Mr. President. The volume works well. I rise in opposition to this bill and there's three basic points I'd like to make if I may. Number one, it's -- this bill -- this policy is bad for -- for business. That was well documented in the Crain's article and has been written extensively, in Chicago publications in particular. Secondly, it's bad, I think, tax policy. You know, we have a system in Cook County that is very complicated and fraught with all sorts of problems with classification. You know, the policy is basically redistributing a tax burden from areas that tend to be wealthier to areas that tend to be poorer. If you represent an area that has experienced slow growth in terms of the value of property assessments, look out, because the -- the cap -- the seven-percent cap on properties that tend to be in areas that are wealthier or areas where people are investing or there's increased interest, that'll be capped at seven percent, but that excess assessed value is going to be laid off some where else.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

So I can't, for the life of me, figure out why anyone who represents an area where property value has been stagnant would possibly consider voting for this. And lastly, and Senator Radogno touched on it, this has an impact on schools. Don't kid There's a reason why these school districts are opposed to it. And I got to tell you, a lot of us over here on this side of the aisle, and I know a lot of others in the Chamber on both sides of the aisle, are a little bit offended with the process here, once again. And it's -- I think it represents an example of a disregard for the process of governing. But there was a fiscal note filed in committee in accordance with the State law, and the law specifically says, "In the case of bills having a potential fiscal impact on school districts, the fiscal note shall be prepared by the State Superintendent of Education." Lo and behold, the only fiscal note that was filed in response to our request is on Illinois Department of Revenue letterhead. And it appears as though there's like a blank space there, where they just drop in the bill number - blank will not have a fiscal impact on State revenues, nor will it have a fiscal impact on the Illinois Department of Revenue. This does not comply with State And I just wanted to note for the record that we're a little bit disappointed in the administration, wish they were a little more serious about governing, and we wish that the sponsor and those who have respect for the process would insist that it is adhered to. So I rise in opposition for lots of reasons. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, the -- the veterans' -- provisions in this bill are naturally good. So a lot of us would like to support the bill just to support those items, but, you know, naturally it's attached to the larger issue of this bill. I'd also like to thank the sponsor, my dear friend, for giving me an opportunity today to stand up and argue like a respected Democrat. Here's what I mean: previous speakers have suggested, is not a cap on anything; it's a shift. And really, it's like reverse Robin Hood: taking from the -- you know, where Robin Hood went and took from the rich, gave to the poor, this is taking from the poor and giving to the rich property tax relief. So, you know, and -- and it -- it -- I have that same reaction as Senator Cronin had, that there are some of you in the Chamber, especially on the Democrat side, in Cook County, where -- where they -- this bill is creating winners and losers - we should all be winners - but winners and losers in your neighborhoods. I think it was Tip O'Neill - again, a respected Democrat out of Boston - who said, "All politics are local." You know, if you do a neighborhood by neighborhood analysis of how this is going to affect some of your districts, just to give you a couple of examples where two-thirds of the people who you serve will -- will lose under this proposal versus win under the proposal: Armour Square - seventy-three percent of the people - almost three out of four people - will end up paying more tax rather than less tax, and that's for Senator Munoz and Senator Hunter. As you consider voting for this bill, those three-quarters of your constituents will have to may more to give property tax relief to the most fortunate who have their property values increasing. Auburn Gresham is also at two-thirds.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

is Senator Jones and Senator Collins. Senator Maloney - is going to affect one of your areas. Calumet Heights is another. Seventy-four percent of the people will end up paying more rather than less. That's Senator Raoul and Trotter. And there's a whole list of these, where it's going to affect 'em negatively. So I would say that this is not the direction that you go. I -- I advise a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 13 and I applaud all the work the sponsor has done. As Chair of the Revenue Committee, we've extensively studied this legislation. We had a very long hearing in Chicago. I want to address just one point. There has been much made of the winners and losers, and the -the opponents are fond of pointing at all the losers. think we need to clarify those terms. Let me give you an example in -- in very overly simple dollar amounts. Let's say last year your taxes were twenty dollars and my taxes were twenty dollars. This year you're faced with your taxes going from twenty dollars to twenty-six dollars - a pretty dramatic improvement. My taxes would go down to seventeen dollars. With seven percent in place, your taxes may only go up to twenty-three dollars and mine may go down only to eighteen dollars. The opponents are characterizing me as a loser. My taxes went down, but they didn't go down as far as they might have otherwise. I haven't yet met a constituent whose taxes went down who viewed themselves as a loser. We have an opportunity to help an awful lot of

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

constituents who have contacted us in our district offices frantic that their taxes are going up beyond their ability to pay. If we're going to finance that by keeping taxes from going down further for folks, none of those folks have called my office complaining that they are a loser, but I sure have heard from a lot of folks who are going to get soaked by a major tax increase if we don't pass this bill. I urge you all to put that into perspective and to vote Aye. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link, to close, succinctly.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This has been some very interesting debate we've had and I commend the Chairman of the Revenue, Senator Harmon, for having a subject matter hearing on this. And we had a lot of people show up for it. And you know what was interesting about it: We had a number of people show up, number of residents, and these people were telling us stories about how much money they have saved by this bill going through. But they told us the horror stories of how much money this would cost them if we do not extend this bill. But you know what we did not have in this room at that, we did not have one business, one corporation, one company that came there and said, "You know what, my tax bill shifted when I lost so much money, it was terrible to me." If it was so terrible to these companies, where were they? The only argument we had the other day, and from a good friend of mine, and I commend him immensely, Gerry Roper, who I think the world of, came there and said there was a national study of forty-two thousand CEOs - national forty-two thousand CEOs who talk about taxes in general, not about the

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

seven-percent tax assessment cap, but about taxes in general and rankings of the State of Illinois, but it did not talk about any particular business that was a loser. When we talk about school districts or we talk about any other entities, all of these entities have a hold -- hold harmless in 'em. Nobody's going to lose in that regard. No schoolchild is going to go with less because of this bill. What you're having is the residents of this State who are getting out of their houses because they can't afford the property tax. We're giving 'em relief. And let's wake up. We had some eloquent speakers on the other side who have said we talk about education relief, we talk about property tax relief, we talk about this and we do nothing. Well, here's your opportunity to do something about property tax relief. Here's the opportunity. We talk about it, now let's put your action where your mouth is. Let's put it there. You can put it with a green button. Let's vote for it. Give these people relief where they need it. The action is there. Let's vote for it. I ask for fifty-nine green lights. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 13 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 13, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we have done four bills in an hour and forty-five minutes. The pace is about to quicken. Please be prepared. Senate Bill 14. Senator Harmon. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 14.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 14 is a modest, but critical, expansion of the Sex Offender Registration Act. For all of you who read the newspapers and watch the news, we are increasingly seeing stories about sexual predators who are finding and communicating with their -- their victims through the Internet, through e-mail, through instant messaging and other sorts of -- of technologies. Today we require sex offenders to register their real identities - their name and their address, their employer, their automobile - but we don't ask them to register their virtual identities. This bill changes that. It would require a sex offender to register their e-mail addresses, their instant messaging identities, the websites they maintain and use to communicate. I am not aware of any opposition to the bill, and I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 14 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 14, having received the

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 20. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 29. Senator Sieben. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 29.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This legislation amends the Administrative Code to make it clear, with respect to actions to review decisions of a hearing officer or a county zone {sic} of appeals, parties of records means only the hearing officer or the zoning board of appeals and applicants before the hearing officer or the zoning board of appeals. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 29 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 29, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 31. Senator Millner. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 31.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill amends the Crime Victims Compensation Act by providing an alternative time for filing the claim. This legislation allows crime victims to file the claims within one year after the criminal indictment of a person for a crime upon which this claim is based. Currently, it's two years after the crime. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question, shall Senate Bill 31 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, one -- none voting Present. Senate Bill 31, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 46. Senator Garrett. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 46. Out of the record. Senate Bill 50. Whoop. Back to Senate Bill 46. Do you want it, Senator Garrett? I asked you to be prepared, everyone. We're rolling. Senate Bill 46. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 46.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 46 creates the Green Governments Illinois Act. It provides for the creation of the Green Governments Coordinating Council and sets out the composition and responsibilities of the Council. Gives the Council the authority to solicit and receive grants to fulfill the Council's functions and to solicit, use and publish advice and information to assist in the Council's duties. Provides that participation in the Green Governments Illinois program by units of State and local government and educational institutions. Sets out responsibilities of State agencies under the Act by August 1, 2007. And it provides that a member of the Lieutenant Governor's staff shall be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of a Green Governments Illinois website with specified content. Effective immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President. This bill came through Energy and Environment. It was unanimous. We think it's a good bill and we urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 46 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 46, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of page 3. Senate Bill 50. Senator -- Senator Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate -- Senate Bill 54. Leader

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Watson. Leader Watson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 55. Senator Sullivan. Senator Sullivan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 57. Senator Demuzio. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 57.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 57 amends the Illinois Finance Authority Act regarding the -- the part of agribusiness -- energy-related agribusiness. And what that does is to basically add additional authority for them to be able to increase their amounts for agribusiness.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 57 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 57, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 65. Senator Silverstein. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 65.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. -- whoa. Wake everyone up here. This -- Senate Bill 65 amends the Downstate Pension Article, the pension board, which requires the -- the transfer of property proceeds to be within thirty days after the county receives them, so they can be distributed to the pension funds where they are located.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. I stand in support of the bill. It passed unanimously in committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 65 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 65, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 77. Senator Garrett. Out of the record. Senate Bill 119. Senator Jacobs. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 119.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Mr. President, this bill came to me from a constituent. It simply allows State employees who use the sick bank to trade time between the spouses if one of their children is very, very ill and they've exhausted all their other resources. I think it's a commonsense approach and I would appreciate your favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 119 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 119, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 120. Senator Jacobs. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 120.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Mr. President, this is a bill that we passed out of the Senate last year that was not acted on in the House. It is a reimbursement of mileage and raising of -- of the mileage rate so that the employees that we hire are no longer carrying the six-million-dollar burden that we put upon them. It'll allow the State to pick up that cost, and hopefully the Speaker will move on our action today. I appreciate your affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Jacobs, what's the current mileage reimbursement rate and what would Senate Bill 120, if it became law, move that to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

The current rate is 44.5. And what this will do, it'll bring it up with the federal rate and then they won't have to redo it every year. It'll stay with that current federal rate. It just seems to me that if we're asking our employees to pick up that cost, people that are making very little money anyway, most of 'em in social services, it just is a matter of -- of good policy for the State to pick up their share.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, it seems, Senator Jacobs, that this bill raises two issues. One is increasing the reimbursement rate. The other issue is tying our rate to the federal government from now on. If, in a year or two, the federal government decides to drop its reimbursement rate, is it fair to say that Senate Bill 120 would also drop the State employees' reimbursement rate? Thank you, Mr. President.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Jacobs, to respond and close.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. I would like to correct the record. The -- the rate is 48.5, not 44.5 as I stated. And if the federal rate drops, we will drop too. That's in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 120 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 120, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 138. Senator Cronin. Senator Cronin? Out of the record. Senate Bill 143. Senator Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 152. Senator Haine. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 152.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This bill simply expands the Metro-East Park District to include Macoupin County. It provides for a -- a referendum to be held to consider a tenth of a cent sales tax, which is -- in Madison and St. Clair County. It'll bring parks and green space to the people of Macoupin

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

County, which is in Senator Demuzio's district. She's for the bill. It's a kumbaya moment. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

To the bill. Or, actually, will the sponsor yield? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He -- he indicates he will. Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank -- thank you very much. Senator Haine, in committee I had expressed some concern with regard to reimbursement to counties in the event there were expenses. Let me reference Section {sic} (subsection) (d) that states that all counties and communities comprising shall make available upon written request from the District, at no cost to the District, any and all technical information. Is there a cost associated with the collection of that data, and will the counties be reimbursed? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

...don't think there's a -- a big cost here. I think this is -- I'm not sure what it is. It's data on population. But I don't know what cost there would be. This is simply incorporating Macoupin County into a -- a district made up of Madison and St. Clair counties to allow Macoupin to receive funds to assist them in development of parks, bike trails and other things. So I -- I don't know what cost there would be. I asked the person representing the Metro-East Parks. He -- he doesn't think there's any costs. But I can't tell you that.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

And I understand that concern and we, too, have provided him with this new information. What I would ask - because I do support the intent of the legislation - is that we address it as this bill goes over to the House and we're ensured that the counties are not incurring any additional expense associated with this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Haine, to close. Respond and close.

SENATOR HAINE:

I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 152 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 152, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Chair would like to remind you, we're going to calibrate the cameras at the end of -- right at the end today. So please be in your seat unless you want to be green or blue and not look as gorgeous as you are throughout Session. Senate Bill 154. Senator Link. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 154.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the West Nile virus bill, basically with respect -- this is a -- the continuance of the fifty-cent fee on new and used tires collected. And this -- purpose of this money is to be used for West Nile research and make it permanent. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Question -- Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. In committee, we talked about the -- the concern about these funds being swept in the past and -- and I think the sponsor had checked on that, and -- and what was the result of that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

These -- these funds have never been swept in the years that they've been active.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Risinger?

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. There was concern that -- about sweeps. The tire tax has been swept, but not this particular fund. The -- the West -- West Nile virus is a real issue. We think that that fifty cents ought to be continued and I think it came out of committee with one negative vote. So I intend to

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

vote for the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dahl.

SENATOR DAHL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Risinger just answered my question. I was looking at the bill here and it says that this has been swept. Mr. Link, you're -- you're telling me that it has not - this particular fund has never been swept?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Senator Dahl, the West Nile portion of the Tire Fund has never been swept since it's been enacted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Righter, do -- Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Link, I apologize. There's some confusion, at least on this side of the aisle, with regards to where this money will be deposited and what funds or - or fund that helps -- that deal with West Nile virus may or may not be swept. Our information is, is that just in this year - in fact, in the current fiscal year - that three-quarters of a million dollars was -- was taken out of the Used Tire Fund. And I wonder if you can confirm that for me, and second, tell me if - if you think that's applicable to continuing this additional fee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

First of all, Senator Righter, I can't believe that there would ever be confusion on that side of the aisle, so that -that amazes me, number one. But number two, is that the depositing of the funds on the West Nile portion is separate entity, and as I indicated to two previous speakers, the funds for West Nile virus out of this has not been swept. It's been used for the purpose of what we wanted it for, on research and development of the West Nile virus for the -- since it's been enacted, and that's what it's going to be continued to -- used for and it will not be swept.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I apologize, Senator Link, and the confusion is obviously all mine, and it often is. But I get the feeling in your comments that we're kind of parsing hairs, a little like we do with the Common School Fund and the lottery. I mean, the Used Tire Fund -- is there money from the Used Tire Fund that is used to deal with the West Nile virus? Are there transfers made out of that fund in order -- and put in the West Nile virus fund or the Public Health Emergency Fund? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

This fifty cents is an additional amount of money already that's -- is being taxed on the used and new tires. There's other money that's being taxed on used and new tires. The fifty cents is additional money that was appropriated three years ago or four years ago - I forgot when we did it - and when we did it,

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

the sole purpose of that fifty cents was for the West Nile virus. That money has stayed intact for the sole purpose of West Nile. That is the money that we are talking about today. That's the money that we want to continue. That's the money that we want to stay intact.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Trotter. The question is, shall Senate Bill 154 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 154, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 184. Senator Righter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 186. Senator Viverito. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 186.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill came to me from the Public Library District. And what it basically does is to allow them to have a working cash fund, as all of the park districts and schools do. This is something that's vital to the libraries and I -- I hope that you will be favorable and voting Yes for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Any discussion? Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the -- the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

I -- I certainly am supportive of the libraries and I understand this. But I want to make sure I understand this. Does this make it easier for the library -- is this -- can this be considered a backdoor tax? Can this be easier for the libraries to create a tax to create this fund?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

I'll -- no, that's really not the intent at all. It's just to be in more compliance, as the -- as the parks and school districts are doing today. It will be invested properly. As you well know, library districts throughout the State of Illinois are people that are extremely dedicated to their well-being of -- of -- of creating a -- an environment that's advantageous for the young and the old.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 186 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay and none voting Present. Senate Bill 57 {sic} (186), having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

recognition, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your inquiry, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Hendon, you announced a little bit earlier that they were going to be calibrating the cameras to make sure that we've got the correct picture. And of course, I, like the other fifty-eight Members of the Body, want to make sure that we look good for all the people who are viewing us on the Internet. I wonder, Mr. President, if it would be appropriate in that vein for me to request that you and I trade jackets. That's a particularly attractive jacket you've got on. I would like to wear that for my picture. Would that be possible? I just ask the Chair to take it under advisement. We'll talk about it later. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator -- Senator Righter, you know, there's a reason I -- I allow you to talk more than anyone else on that side of the aisle, other than Leader Watson, and -- and -- and that's it. But you can pick one of these up. I will tell you where. Just get your wallet ready. The Senate will return to Senate Bill 55 for Senator Sullivan. Madam Secretary... And -- and for your information, this is -- we will be calibrating the -- the cameras very soon. Senator Sullivan. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 55.

(Secretary reads title of bill) 3rd Reading of the bill.

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 55 amends the Methamphetamine Precursor Control Act. Last fall, while I was at a meeting, a drug force task meeting, over in western Illinois, I asked members of law enforcement, I said, "How -- how has the legislation that we have passed over the last several years dealt with and helped you to fight the meth problem?" And they said it's really made a big difference. number of labs have been -- has -- those numbers have come down. They've made more arrests. It's been, you know, very, very successful. And I said, "Well, what else can we do to help?" And they -- they suggested that -- when individuals go into buy the ingredients for meth and if they use a fake ID, the -- the penalty for doing that is minimal. And they said they thought that those penalties should be increased. So that's the purpose of this legislation. It increases the fines and penalties for those individuals who knowingly use a false or altered driver's license or other ID to purchase a targeted -- methamphetamine precursor. And I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 55 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 55, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Will

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

all Members please be at their desks? We are about to calibrate the cameras. This won't take long at all. Do not go far. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, during calibration your microphones may be active. Your microphones may be active, so be aware of that. You wouldn't want to say anything that you wouldn't want the public or your husband or wives to hear back at home.

(Senate calibrates Internet cameras)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With the leave of the Body, all resolutions read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, have there been any objections filed with -- to any resolutions on the Consent Calendar?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

If not, the question is, shall there be any -- resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion's carried. The resolutions are adopted. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 169, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

10th Legislative Day

2/23/2007

Madam Secretary, on the Order of Resolutions. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Joint Resolution 33.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 33)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Halvorson moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration and the adoption of Senate Resolution {sic} 33. Those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The -- the rules are suspended. Senator Halvorson moves the adoption of Senate Resolution {sic} 33. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Pursuant to Senate Resolution {sic} 33, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday, February 28th, 2007. Senate stands adjourned.